1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA			
9				
10	ROBERT WILLIAM SHIPE, Jr.,			
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 13-cv-05912 JRC		
12	v.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT		
13 14	CAROLYN W COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration,	TO 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)		
15	Defendant.			
16 17	This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local			
	Magistrate Judge Rule MJR 13 (see also Notice of Initial Assignment to a U.S. Magistrate Judge			
18 19	and Consent Form, Dkt. 5; Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge, Dkt. 6).			
20	This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §			
21	406(b) (see Dkt. 25). Defendant has no objection to plaintiff's request (see Dkt. 26).			
22	The Court may allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who represented a Social Security			
23	Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a favorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in			
24   24	excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); Grisbrecht v.			

Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first to such agreement and will conduct an independent review to assure the reasonableness of the fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved. See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or if a windfall would result from the requested fee. See Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151 (9th Cir. 2009) (*citing Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 808). 9 Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (see 10 Dkt. 25, Attachment 3). See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808. Defendant stipulated to remand the matter subsequent to plaintiff's filing of her Opening Brief, and after plaintiff's second hearing, the ALJ awarded benefits to plaintiff (Dkt. 25, Attachment 1, p. 1). There has not been excessive delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee. Plaintiff's total back payment was \$67,696.00 (see id., Attachment 3). Plaintiff has moved for a net attorney's fee of \$10,924.00 (see Motion, Dkt. 25, p. 1), and the Court has considered plaintiff's gross attorney's fee of \$16,924.00 (25% of past due benefits); the administrative attorney's fee of \$6,000.00; and the EAJA award received by plaintiff's attorney in the amount of \$5,289.07 that was garnished pursuant to the Department of the Treasury's Offset program (see Dkt. 25, Attachment 7). See 31 U.S.C. §§ 3711(a), 3716(a); Astrue v. Ratliff, 560 U.S.C. 586, 589, 593, 130 S.Ct. 2521, 2524, 2527 (2010); Parish v. Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin., 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012). Based on plaintiff's motion and supporting documents (see Dkt. 25 and Attachments 1-7), and with no objection from defendant (Dkt. 26), it is hereby ORDERED that attorney's fees 24

2

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

## Case 3:13-cv-05912-JRC Document 27 Filed 07/22/16 Page 3 of 3

1	in the amount of \$10,924.00 be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b).		
2	When issuing the 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) check for payment to plaintiff's attorney herein, Social		
3	Security is directed to send to plaintiff's attorney \$10,924.00, minus any applicable processing		
4	fees as allowed by statute.		
5	Dated this 22nd day of July, 2016.		
6	I March Cua Luco		
7	J. Richard Creatura		
8	United States Magistrate Judge		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			